



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Vignia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

				771 7
APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/087,559	03/01/2002	Richard P. Lamothe	4341-32-1	2177
75	590 09/23/2003			
McCormick, Paulding & Huber City Place II 185 Asylum Street			EXAMINER	
			PETERSON, KENNETH E	
Hartford, CT (06103-3402		ART UNIT PAPER NUM	
			3724	3
			DATE MAILED: 09/23/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		<u> </u>
	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/087,559	LAMOTHE, RICHARD P.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Kenneth E Peterson	3724
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with	th correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a rep - If NO period for reply specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailir earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status	.136(a). In no event, however, may a repoly within the statutory minimum of thirty (I will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHe. cause the application to become ABAI	ly be timely filed (30) days will be considered timely. 1S from the mailing date of this communication. NDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	·	
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) T	his action is non-final.	
3) Since this application is in condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice under Disposition of Claims	vance except for formal matter or <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D.	ers, prosecution as to the merits is . 11, 453 O.G. 213.
4) Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application	n.	
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra	awn from consideration.	
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.		
6)☐ Claim(s) is/are rejected.		
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.		
8) Claim(s) <u>1-23</u> are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.	
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine		
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ acce		
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	-	· · ·
11) The proposed drawing correction filed on	•	approved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in re 12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	· -	
-	xammer.	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120	on maiorite conden OF II O O C	440(-) (1) (0
13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreiga) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:	in priority under 35 U.S.C. 9	119(a)-(d) or (f).
1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documen	its have been received	
2. Certified copies of the priority documen		olipation No
3. Copies of the certified copies of the price application from the International Bu	ority documents have been re ureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	eceived in this National Stage
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list		•
14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domest		•
 a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language present 15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domes 		
Attachment(s)		
1)	5) Notice of Info	mmary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) ormal Patent Application (PTO-152)

Application/Control Number: 10/087,559 Page 2

Art Unit: 3724

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- Claims 2 and 5, drawn to a paper web handling system having a adjustable take-up roller.
- II. Claim 3, drawn to a paper web handling system having a braking means.
- III. Claims 7,13 and 23, drawn to a paper web handling system having a angle adjustment means for the turnbar.
- IV. Claims 8-10,20,22, drawn to a paper web handling system having pressurized gas perforations.
- V. Claim 17, drawn to a paper web handling system having a travel register mechanism.
- 2. Claims 1,4,6,11,12,14-16,18,19 and 21 will be examined with the election of any of groups II-IV. Claim 1 links the inventions of groups I-V. Claims 6 and 21 link the inventions of groups III and IV. The restriction requirement of the linked inventions is subject to the nonallowance of the linking claims. Upon the allowance of the linking claim(s), the restriction requirement as to the linked inventions shall be withdrawn and any claim(s) depending from or otherwise including all the limitations of the allowable linking claim(s) will be entitled to examination in the instant application. Applicant(s) are advised that if any such claim(s) depending from or including all the limitations of the allowable linking claim(s) is/are presented in a continuation or divisional application, the claims of the continuation or divisional application may be subject to provisional statutory and/or nonstatutory double patenting rejections over the claims of the instant

Application/Control Number: 10/087,559 Page 3

Art Unit: 3724

application. Where a restriction requirement is withdrawn, the provisions of 35 U.S.C. 121 are no longer applicable. *In re Ziegler*, 44 F.2d 1211, 1215, 170 USPQ 129, 131-32 (CCPA 1971). See also MPEP § 804.01.

- 3. The inventions are distinct, each from the other because the inventions of groups I-V are related as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combination. The subcombinations are distinct from each other if they are shown to be separately usable. For example, the adjustable take-up roller of group I could be used without the braking mean of group II, and conversely, the braking means of group II could be employed with a fixed take-up roller, unlike the adjustable take-up roller of group I. See MPEP § 806.05(d).
- 4. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification and because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.
- 5. There is an unmanageable burden on the office to examine all of these groups together. See MPEP 808.02(C). For example, the adjustable take-up roller of group I would need to be searched in class 82, subclass 268, as well as having it's own unique text search. The braking means of group II would not have to be searched as above.

Application/Control Number: 10/087,559 Page 4

Art Unit: 3724

text search.

but instead would have to be searched in class 225, subclass 52, along with a different

6. This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct

species of the claimed invention:

Species A – figure 1

Species B – figure 2

Species C – figure 3

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for

prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is

finally held to be allowable. Currently, some of the claims are generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification

of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims

readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim

is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless

accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration

of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include

all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims

are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the

elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Application/Control Number: 10/087,559

Art Unit: 3724

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

- 7. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).
- 8. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).
- 9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ken Peterson whose telephone number is 703-308-2186. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Thursday between 7am and 4pm. If attempts to reach the examiner are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Allan Shoap can be reached on 703-308-1082.

In lieu of mailing, it is encouraged that all formal responses be faxed to 703-872-9302. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1148.

kp September 21, 2003

KENNETH E. PETERSON PRIMARY EXAMINER

Page 5